



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/696,901

10/30/2003

Steven G. Glazik

0401-0002

9246

7590

07/10/2006

Daniel M. Riess
Cook, Alex, McFarron, Manzo,
Cummings & Mehler, Ltd.
200 West Adams, Suite 2850
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

PETRAVICK, MEREDITH C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3671

DATE MAILED: 07/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/696,901	Applicant(s) GLAZIK ET AL.	
	Examiner Meredith C. Petravick	Art Unit 3671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24,25 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 26 and 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Pre-appeal Brief filed on 3/13/2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31. A new notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee will not be required for applicant to appeal from the new Office action. Any appeal brief filed on or after September 13, 2004 must comply with 37 CFR 41.37.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 24-25 and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,261,153 to Johnston in view of U.S. Pat. No. 22,235 to Hadcock and U.S. Pat. No. 3,003,149 to Grashow.

The combined teachings of Johnston, Hadcock and Grashow disclose the claimed method. Johnston discloses a method of putting a hollow finger (40) on a portion of a harvester

Art Unit: 3671

reel pickup tine finger (13). Johnston also teaches that tine failure results from erosion or breaking of the tip or end portion of a tine scraping the ground (Col. 1, lines 37-40).

However, Johnston does not disclose the step of putting the hollow finger on a broken portion of the tine finger.

Like Johnston, Hadcock also deals with the problem of preventing failure of rake teeth (See second paragraph). Hadcock solves this problem by installing a replaceable tip (C) on the rake tooth.

Like Johnston, Grashow also solves the problem of a breaking tip or end portion of an elongated device. However, Grashow teaches that it is known to merely provide a new hollow portion (10) or the broken end portion (22). (Column 1, lines 22-38). This allows a repair to be made without disassembling the entire device.

Given the teachings in Johnston, Hadcock and Grashow, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace a broken reel pickup tine finger by placing a hollow replacement finger over the broken reel, in order to facilitate quick repair of the finger.

Regarding claims 25 and 27, the hollow finger in Johnston is frictionally fit on the reel tine and snapped on.

Regarding claim 28, in the combination substantially all of the remaining portion of the broken finger is in the cavity.

Regarding claims 29 and 30, Johnston doesn't require tools.

Regarding claim 31, the shape in Johnston is a substantial replica of the harvester reel pickup tine finger.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 24-25 and 28-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-23 are allowed.
6. Claims 26 and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meredith C. Petravick whose telephone number is 571-272-6995. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 8:00 a.m.- 5:00 p.m..

Art Unit: 3671

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will can be reached on 571-272-6998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Meredith C Petravick
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3671

July 3, 2006